Frederick Banks,

Defenderick

)

15cn 168

Exhibit in Support of Melense to County.
Tempa Foggy v. US Cheplain, 2:08 EV 00648 KCJ-RJJ (DC Neu)

Defendant Frederick Bunks, in American Indian ("Banks") hier the foregoing exhibit in Support of Defense to count of Tampa Foggy, et al., v. U.S. Chaplain, et al., 2:08 CV 006 48 RLJ-RJJ (DC New) (DOC 32) and represents,

I In Count of the government alleges that Banks made a false

Statement that Laurel Muhelle Schlemmer was in a CIA Telepatric

Behavior Modification program and that it was false that this program

exists. Yet unclassified pocuments on "Telepatric Behavior Modification"

exist on the CIA's own website see at www. foia.cia.you so it is

the CIA not Banks that confirms the existence of the program.

2. Also, a plaintift named Tumre Foggy made similar claims in

Foggy v. us government (or Idaho) to Foggy v. Us chaptain; dioder of the program.

As a result Tama foggy is a deknow which told her to kill her son.

As a result Tama foggy is a deknow witheld in this case and will prove through

ther testimony that the alleged Count of false statements are not talks. Laure is

Schlemmen is also a witness.

3. Additionally, the Court should be ware that in duel cases where defendant that removed Bunks. Hate bled cases to federal court that Court has removed book cases to State Court in whor words banks representing himself challenged the removes and won those decisions while this court continues to wrong fully assert that he is incompetent to represent himself see Banks us Larote jet at 4: 17-20-52479-137P (OC NOOH) (DOC 8) and Banks v. Rosado,

et al, 4: 17-EV-02499-BYP ( DE NOOH) (DEC 11).

Respectfully himmedded,

Frederick Banks
110 5th Ave #0063533
Youngstown, OH 44503
Volendant

configure of lemie

I hereby contry that on this 5th day of may, 2018 I lerved a true + correct copy of the foregoing by main delivery upon the following;

Office of the US Afformer Your US Cf Hie 700 Grand Street 1. Historyh, pot 15219

Frederick Burnics

The Third count court of Appeals also usued a broking scredule on the issue

If Banks prior consultan in USA & Banks, oyep176 (wopp) should be vocated

on Banks pro se Appeal and Banks represents himself in that Appeal Sea

USA s. Banks, No 18-1165 (3x4 cir.) if Banks wins he will have yethen a prior

Conviction vocated in which he alleged viction FBT Agent in this case let him up an

while this Court claims he is incompetent to prepresent himself. This is a crimmal Appeal.